

AGENDA

JOINT CITY/COUNTY/LPS MEETING

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 2003

7:30 A.M.

COUNTY- CITY BUILDING - CONFERENCE ROOM 113

- I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - August 4, 2003 Joint City/County/LPS Meeting
- II. A. Budget Expectations - Discussion (Jon Camp)
B. Insurance Requirements for Independent Contractors (K. Eagan)
- III. OLD BUSINESS
- IV. NEW BUSINESS
- V. FUTURE MEETING DATE
- VI. ADJOURNMENT

RECEIVED

OCT 23 2003

LANCASTER COUNTY
BOARD

RECEIVED

JAN 16 2004

LANCASTER COUNTY
BOARD

MINUTES
for the
JOINT LPS/CITY/COUNTY MEETING

November 4, 2003 - 7:30 a.m.

County-City Building - Conference Room 113
Lincoln, Nebraska

COUNCIL MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Jon Camp, Glenn Friendt, Ken Svoboda, Terry Werner, (arrived late); ABSENT: Jonathan Cook, Annette McRoy, Patte Newman
MAYOR: Mayor Seng in Attendance

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE: Larry Hudkins, Deb Schorr (arrived late), Ray Stevens, Bob Workman; ABSENT: Bernie Heier

SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Superintendent Philip Schoo, Kathy Danek, Jim Garver, Lillie Larsen, Keith Prettyman, Ed Zimmer ABSENT: Doug Evans, Don Mayhew

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: [Noted from Sign-In Sheet - Others in attendance not noted] Pat Leach, John Dale, Lincoln City Libraries; Trish Owne, Lancaster County; Dave Myers, LPS; Mark Bowen, Mayor's Office; Bruce Bohrer, Lincoln Chamber of Commerce, Kerry Eagan, County Commissioners Office; Joan Ray Council Secretary, Darrell Podany, Aide to Council Members Camp, Friendt and Svoboda.

I Approval of Minutes - August 4, 2003 Joint City/County/LPS Meeting

Mr. Camp called for a motion to approve those minutes. A motion for approval was made and seconded which carried by the following vote: AYES: Camp, Friendt, Svoboda, Seng, Hudkins, Stevens, Workman, Danek, Garver, Larsen, Prettyman, Zimmer; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cook, McRoy, Newman, Heier, Evans, Mayhew

THIS MEETING WAS SCHEDULED TO ADDRESS THE FOLLOWING ISSUES:

BUDGET EXPECTATIONS - DISCUSSION

INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS FOR INDEPENDENT CONTRACTORS

BUDGET EXPECTATIONS - DISCUSSION - Discussion began with reference to the new building going on in the District, and the challenges being faced because of the limitations set by State Statutes due to the reduction State aid. Expenses are increasing more quickly than revenues. As the student populations grows, of course the expenses increase, and there are questions raised on the matter of the most efficient use of the current buildings. LPS is working on ways to achieve maximum efficiency from the use of each building. Mr. Prettyman noted that every time the School Board adds a new building, we have significant additional operating costs. So, those are expenditures that have to be planned for on an on-going annual basis. That goes on all the time. Certainly if we have new building, we'll have those costs that we'll be facing.

There are significant costs that LPS is facing as a result of the "No Child Left Behind" program, and State mandates with regards to testing and assessment. So, there are just a number of items which are on a regular basis increasing expenses as opposed to just those that we would expect for an increase in the population bases in our schools.

Mr. Camp stated that, as Mr. Prettyman noted in his comments on emerging costs associated with the new facility, personnel is, for each entity, obviously a big cost item. He asked how Mr. Prettyman saw that effecting the long-term school budget? Mr. Prettyman noted that as our population grows, we need to plan for how we're going to hire teachers. What size classrooms we're going to have - those kinds of questions. We have not actually funded for growth in the student body for the last three years, because the funds haven't been there, which means, overall, an increase in class size as a result of the growing student population and a static, if not shrinking, number of teachers to take care of those students.

Anytime you open a building, there are other costs that will be included in the operating expenses. Even if we kept the same number of teachers, opening the building is going to require that we have additional custodial staff, additional food service staff, additional administrative and clerical staff. So, all those things have to be planned in as well.

Ms. Larsen commented that one area that has not been mentioned, but clearly overlaps between the City Council and the School Board and that is in the Transportation System within the City and the cross-walks for kids going to school. One thing that has been very helpful is the placement of the lights on streets that indicate to drivers that there is going to be a change in the signal light coming up. Those have been placed at various locations around the City. Those are things that you as a City Council recommended for placement. Also tunnels under busy streets are improvements that the City has provided. She stated that she could see a huge need coming up for placement of those cross-walks, the additional lights, the over-passes (or under passes) where we have potential school sites. We have a need for the Council to look at that and be prepared to have those in place.

Mr. Garver noted that the general and building funds mesh. If we don't have a school in the neighborhood and it is not a contiguous area, then we will generally bus to a school that does have room. Just as the City is looking at new developments, a question that should be asked is what school will the kids in the area be going to. Chances are, it won't be the school they can see. We have a little bit of room in a corridor going down "O" Street starting with Saratoga, Prescott, Randolph out to Riley and Eastridge Schools. These facilities each have a little bit of room (100 students here, 150 there). He noted that there was a little room yet at Rousseau, but LPS is out of room for elementary space on the fringes of the City. The Fire Marshall limits us in terms of occupancy. So, please keep that in mind for a future development standpoint. Schools should be included in the "infrastructure" considerations. Mr. Camp thought our Planning Director could consider that with developers in the future.

Mr. Friendt asked about the two sites that seem imminent, wondering if we were still coordinating between the City and LPS and other entities, to be sure that we look at co-location of facilities? Mr. Prettyman stated that he believed they were. As a decision is neared about any of the facilities that we might be planning, we want to make sure that all other entities are included in discussion...to find out what we can co-locate. Ms. Danek noted that is done even in renovation projects. Mr. Prettyman agreed. Mr. Garver added that they always check with the City on future land purchases as well to check for potential problems.

Mr. Camp asked for input from the County Board about some of the financial restraints that the County is facing. Mr. Hudkins commented that, as we look to capital needs for the County, first on the list is the Health Department. Trying to find the expansion space with minimal impact on the Woods Park area has been a challenge, but we're getting closer to meeting that challenge. The County Board's Capital Project for the Health Department, which is funded 37-63% in the General Fund, is funded 50-50% for Capital items. So, that will be a major expenditure for the County as we look at nine to ten million dollars for that expansion. He noted that the Health Department has expressed the desire to stay at their current location, but want to build at this time to meet the needs for 15-20 years out.

Mr. Hudkins noted that the next thing on the County's list of budget concerns as far as Capital is Corrections. He noted that this is always a tough challenge. He thought they could buy some time by looking at day reporting and the bracelet system. We're investigating any means we can as far as probation programs - which is what is getting us by right now in our attempts to meet Jail Standards. We've hired a consultant to give us recommendations which might be implemented. Five-six years down the line, we'll probably be looking at another or an expanded Corrections Facility. Mr. Hudkins thought the cost on that would be \$14-15 million. Mr. Workman noted that the cost is approximately \$100,000 per bed. Mr. Camp asked how that would be financed. Mr. Hudkins answered that it would be done through property taxes and bonds.

Mr. Hudkins noted that for the current facility, they had levied a building fund tax for three years to get it started. If we have that latitude, we'll do that in the future. In Corrections, there isn't much we can do to control costs and we're looking at 10-12% annual increases in those costs.

The next item of County budget concern would be the BryanLGH West facility. They have been talking of acquiring the parking base which is to the south of their lot. Another facility near that location would be the Old St. Mary's building which was the old home of the Health Department which now houses Community Mental Health. They are interested in purchasing all of the County's property at that location....the building as well as the parking area. We can re-locate, so we've been looking for two years for a suitable re-location site. Those are three major Capital items that we'll have coming up within the next six years or so.

He noted that the County, much like the School Board, is facing a financial crunch - and it doesn't look like we're going to get much help from the State anymore. State aid to Cities, Counties and School Districts has all been reduced. The Governor says no new taxes, just cuts when considering the State Budget. In addition to that, the one tax that the County has had that has helped with emergency expenses such as bridges and things like that....the inheritance tax...the State has been making noises about taking the County portion of that away and putting it under their control. That would just further impeded our ability to have any flexibility. Not a very rosy picture, but that is where the County is currently.

Mr. Workman commented that most of the County's functions are mandated by the State. One of them that is not is Mental Health. He believed the County spent about \$6,000,000 per year on mental health. There appears to be some major changes at the State level for that funding. We continue to aggressively pursue grants in that area, but there will be some big decisions for us in mental health this year.

Mr. Camp asked Mayor Seng if she would like to enumerate some of the budget challenges the City of Lincoln may be facing. Mayor Seng commented that probably our biggest challenge is to find the mechanism for bringing dollars in for infrastructure. She commented on the meeting yesterday with the Budget Office to begin looking at the budget process. One of the things we haven't found yet is the right mechanism for infrastructure financing. We're living on sales tax receipts more and more at the City level. If we're going to keep doing that, we have to figure out how to deal with economic development. One of the keys there is to have the infrastructure in place. So, we just take a step at a time. Although we had hoped to have, in November, a bond issue on infrastructure financing, that did not happen. The Infrastructure Finance Committee will be meeting shortly - and one of the things on the Agenda is to determine how we move forward. There is continuing effort to work with the State also with an occupation tax on gas, but nonetheless, infrastructure financing is a number one issue.

Mayor Seng continued, noting that at the Budget meeting, they had also discussed personnel in comparison to the City's growth. Personnel has not grown significantly along with the growth of the City....as the LPS Board has discussed in connection with school expansion.

Mr. Camp asked if any Council Members would like to comment on the budget process. Mr. Svoboda, noting that so far this morning, we've been talking "bricks and mortar and pavement", stated that, though it was not really addressing needs, he wanted to share with those present that yesterday at the budget briefing, one of the things that we discussed was developing a priority system for services - for functions.

Mr. Svoboda noted that the School Board wrangles with that on a regular basis. Last year the debate was on school athletics and busing. He asked if other school districts have gone through a prioritization process where the fundamentals of education are reviewed. Granted, one of our highest priorities should be a well-rounded graduating student, but we also need to recognize that with the basics, which now no longer include only the Three "R"s, but also include computer science, there is some type of prioritization system or, at least discussion, where LPS would review the various classes that are taught and determine whether there is value to the well-rounded student in that class, or if it's just there out of history and tradition - especially when budgets become tight. Quite frankly, that is what we in the City will be looking at as a possible budget savings. He thought the County has been developing that process as well.

Mr. Garver answered that it has been mentioned that with class size rising, it really doesn't matter - 220 hours - if a student wants it all in English Literature, fine. But, that is not what a student needs....but that's basic education. He explained the programs available, noting that with diversity of classes, students are contributing to their education. There are classes as large as 35 students, in the Senior High Schools, and the drop-out rate is 16-18%. There are a lot of kids that don't do well in such a system. And what is that cost to the City then- when kids are dropped out and on the streets. We have to strike a balance in terms of basic education. We start that in elementary school and Lincoln kids are in the 87th percentile in math skills; reading is a combination of phonics and literature; we do teach and emphasize the basics. Other kids are ready for Advanced Physics and we provide those classes for those kids. It gets them ready for college and makes them a better student. Athletics is not required, but the General fund is a major support source for Athletics, including coaches. Other than that, there is only about a \$300,000 contribution for all the Debate, Speech, Football, Tennis, everything....that's how much we've been cutting back regularly for the last ten years.

Mr. Friendt commented, getting back to bricks and mortar for a minute, we [the City] share in the Health Department expansion. One of the questions that has come up with the Fire Fighters is the issue of Fire Stations. This has been in the media & front pages of the newspaper for a while

and it hasn't gone away. As we keep growing, we not only should ask where our people are going to go to schools, but how are they going to get fire service and police services? Mr. Friendt asked the School Board members if, at this point, they were anticipating a bond issue for the school system this Spring? He stated that the question would be, for us, with the fire stations, how do we plan for that with you so that we're not in a competing situation.

Mr. Zimmer noted that the School Board was working on that closely. He stated that they did not have an answer yet, but one is hoped for early in the year. The study that was commissioned last year which was really a ten-year study, showed that with two schools there are very immediate needs. There is the next tier of needs that are almost "very immediate" needs; then, looking out six years or so, there are a couple of tiers beyond that. If we could do a couple of major renovations in the next year or two, with that six year time line, we'll have critical years for the next round of buildings and a round beyond that. The study recommended all the things that have been mentioned, including looking at boundaries, and maximum utilization. We've been going through those steps very carefully and reporting back to the Board for discussions. He added that the discussions need to be widened on the facility recommendations. Then, we hope to come back with a recommendation from the community group and the School Board's Planning Committee early in the coming year so we can make a wise decision about whether it [bonding] looks possible in the Spring or not.

Mr. Friendt stated that he felt there was a quiet agreement that we're going to wait to see what the school system does about this. But, eventually, we can't keep waiting. We are probably the body that needs to coordinate that and we should all be in sync about what those plans are going to be. Mr. Camp commented that that was one of the reasons he had placed this issue on this Agenda for discussion - so that we could help one another in the coming years to coordinate our efforts.

Ms. Larsen, regarding the question that Mr. Svoboda raised about the curriculum, and the offering of courses to students, commented that a great deal of that is student driven. The course may be offered if there is a demand for it. But, if there is no demand, or a sufficient number of students who have signed up for a course, it may not be offered that semester. It doesn't mean that it might not come back at a later time. It is also a decision at the building level, by the principal at that building. She noted that, at the District Office, there was a Curriculum Coordinator and Instruction Coordinators who are constantly monitoring this as to the offerings available and whether some need to be continued. So, in a sense, yes we do have an on-going study of the curriculum and course offerings.

Ms. Danek commented that some of the things are mandated by law. We have State and Federal regulations and it should be noted that not all of those things that are mandated by law are financed by the entities who require them. This is the same thing the the City and County are dealing with.

Ms. Danek, in reference to Ms. Seng's comments regarding economic development, noted that one of the things that makes Lincoln such a viable place for businesses is because we have such a strong commitment to the schools, through all three of these bodies gathered here today. We have improvement needs and maintenance needs on current structures within our City. We're talking about the fringe and the growth and where we see lots of people moving, but there are also existing buildings that have significant needs within Lincoln. These are all issues we deal with as we discuss needs - which is why we don't have an answer at this point. There are a whole lot of needs that have to be grappled with.

Mayor Seng stated that when we are talking about the bricks and mortar, we need to really talk about our cooperative efforts on community centers. She noted that there was one in the works right now over in the Malone Neighborhood. For the School Board, or for any of us, we may need to be on a bond issue on that at some point. That is in early discussion time right now. The other

item is the Library. She thought there has been a fair amount of talk in regards to Libraries - She noted that there was Library Staff in attendance that might be upset if we didn't mention cooperative efforts in that area. She thought the main branch library should be up for discussion.

Mr. Prettyman said that he would like to go back to questions both from Mr. Svoboda and Mr. Friendt. He was not sure that they had received direct answers. He stated that, in regards to Mr. Friendt's question "are we going to come out with a bond issue"?, obviously Mr. Friendt has been told that we don't know. But, everybody was also certainly told that in North Lincoln for Middle School students, in another two years, we have no place to house 200-300 students. So, that is a need that is there that we have to take care of in some fashion. He stated that he can't imagine, that in good conscience, we're not going to go to the City and at least with that one need say we absolutely have to have a building for these students to go to school. His guess was that it is far more likely than not that we'll have something on the ballot this Spring. He could not imagine that that will not be the case. He added, however, that he was only one out of seven.

Mr. Friendt stated that he appreciated that, because he felt it was obvious to anyone who is watching this discussion. He appreciated a strategic need to wait and get everything in order, but ... what are you going to do? More portables? Teepees? Or are we going to have a bond issue? [Laughter]. Mr. Prettyman answered that the problem is that they've already looked at portables in both of the locations [North Star and Goodrich] and neither one is going to work very well for the student population that we're dealing with. So, that really is not an option - we have to have some option for those students. We do have some other options, not great options, but options that are available to us for some of the elementary school over-crowding situations around the City - some being efficient use of buildings and we'll work through that. But that immediate crunch is one in which he saw no other solution at this time except to go to the voters. There are others that come close to that in need, but they'll have to be looked at. But he could not imagine that there will not be something [bond issue] in the Spring (He reiterated that he was only one out of seven).

Mr. Prettyman, in answer to Mr. Svoboda's question regarding curriculum studies, stated that all of the Board Members here would say that they're not necessarily aware of any such studies. He commented that that is not the sort of thing that they keep their hands on - to find out what is going on in other districts. He did state, that from the LPS Board's standpoint, with regard to the variety of classes that we offer, we look at a number of things. We have our own graduation requirements, so we know that students who graduate from Lincoln Public Schools, not only have to have a certain number of hours that they've completed successfully, but a certain number of designated courses that they've completed. You could say that those designated courses represent the core curriculum. Once the students are done with that, they still have a significant number of hours under both our requirements as a school district and the State's requirements for students to graduate. We have to fill those hours somehow. He felt LPS does that as efficiently as possible. We offer very few classes where there are just a handful of students who are interested. There will be fewer and fewer of those classes as time goes on. That is unfortunate, but it is simply the reality of the budget situation. We just can't afford to have those smaller and smaller classes.

Mr. Svoboda stated that he appreciated that response. He acknowledged that students have to be in class somewhere...they have certain hour requirements and the building size doesn't change because you offer fewer classes. He appreciated that outlook on his question. He added that that is one thing he continues to hear as he speaks to neighborhood groups. They're looking at the schools and county and city issues. They probably don't look at any of us as being the representative of the single entity that we serve, but as one of these many entities.

Mr. Zimmer commented on another aspect of the curriculum offerings. He noted that some of the changes made over the last several years occurred with a great deal of attention and some very quietly. Whether or not to offer Drivers Education had been discussed very extensively about three years ago and it was decided that the community valued it strongly and we would maintain it, even though it was not required. But we cut it last year. Ultimately, very quietly. We couldn't fund it. We were having to make core cuts and now we don't offer Drivers Education any more. It was a valuable program, it was money well spent; but it was money we don't have.

As the high schools looked at making reductions in staff last year, all the levels had to be considered. They quietly made reductions in some of those programs that they most wanted to offer, but had the least utilization. Some folks went back to school this year and were surprised at the things they couldn't take. Those are described, essentially, as building level decisions. We make central budget decisions and in-building decisions work out how to best utilize the funding that is provided.

He added that the difficult thing in deciding about a bond issues is when is the best time and what is the best package to present to the public? In the key study where they looked out ten years, they did a good job of setting up a frame-work with basic priorities, but it doesn't answer the hard questions of all the things we need. The North Middle School situation is at a crisis point. The others are just below that in priority. We have a 10-year list of high priority projects. We need to make some hard decisions on the priority levels because we won't be able to go back again soon to the bonding process. That is why it is difficult to make a definitive statement on the bond issue.

Mr. Friendt also recognized that for the community to know that LPS has done everything you think is possible to make efficient use of the current class space, and be able to report that, is an important step...before you get to a final decision.

Mr. Camp thanked everyone. He felt this had been a good and lively discussion. It sounds like, from the School Board's standpoint, in January, you'll have some more information on potential...more solidification on a bond issue. He would encourage each of the three entities to continue this dialogue and perhaps we could keep this as a regular agenda item to map out our bonding needs and major capital needs. We could expand this over a multi-year horizon. He asked if anyone had any last comments to make on the budget issues.

Mr. Svoboda had a quick comment as it relates to the LPS current budget year which they'll be facing now. He noted that it relates to the School Resource Officers. He urged the LPS Board to re-look at that issue. He said that the City has opted at the discretion of the Mayor and the Police Chief to continue the School Resource Officers program. He observed that the City is now paying for the whole lot and one of the issues that he would like the LPS Board to look at is that of some type of common sharing of that cost. He stated that the City feels that is a valuable need. He knew that the School Board and the School Administrators feel that need as well. He would like to, once again, open the dialogue to look at the funding being renewed and see where we go from there with it. Thank you.

INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS FOR INDEPENDENT CONTRACTORS - Mr. Kerry Eagan came forward to make the presentation. Mr. Eagan stated that this had been placed on the Agenda at the request of Commissioner Stevens. He gave an over-view of what the County was looking at and wanted to draw on the expertise of the three entities gathered today.

He explained that the County had gotten themselves in the position where they have a "one size fits all" policy in regard to insurance requirements for contractors. We've developed some basic insurance requirements which are based on sound risk management principals for our purchasing contracts for large contracts with purchases over \$10,000 whether for services, construction or commodities.

He said that the attorneys have advised them that they really need to be protected under all other contracts too - including grant contracts, or small service contracts or interns with the University. So, we found ourselves in a situation where we're demanding that our contractors provide all of these insurance requirements and, with the County, we want to be protected to the limits of the Tort Claims Act which is \$5,000,000 per occurrence. Now, what we're finding is that, as a practical business matter, it is becoming very difficult to find people who want to do business with us. We're scaring some off.

This is further complicated by the fact that the County is looking at the concept of going self-insured on our General Liability over the next year. He thought what Commissioner Stevens was after was just some common experience and what other entities might do with regard to the problem of requiring insurance for contracts. He noted that, generally, with an independent contractor, we're not liable for their negligence. But, you can be in certain situations and you'll usually transfer the risk with an indemnity clause or something else. But, we have found ourselves kind of in a box and that is the reason this is on the agenda for discussion today.

Mr. Stevens commented that some of us in the County had a meeting last week with the attorneys to talk about this. What he saw as a result of that meeting is that there are at least ten different kinds of business entities that we deal with...with whom we have contracts. Mr. Eagan mentioned the "one size fits all" policy - which just isn't true. It really doesn't "fit all" and, perhaps, shouldn't work that way. In looking at the kinds of legal clauses we should have in those contracts, there are at least ten different items that should or should not be in those contracts. So, what you end up with is a huge matrix of possibilities with hiring someone to do some of the work that the County and perhaps the City and the Lincoln Public Schools really cannot or should not do for themselves.

One example of this is that the County has agreed to put up some money, and the Mayor has agreed to put up some money to do a gambling study within the community. There was one done about about four or five years ago. We were interested in doing another one at this time so that we had some base-line data on the effects of gambling on the community. There is a lot of discussion Statewide regarding expanded gambling in the State and we wanted to know where we stand now with the effects of gambling on our citizens. We were looking at hiring a couple of interns from the University of Nebraska - paying them approximately \$5,000 to perform this study for us, yet our requirements are that they have \$5,000,000 worth of liability insurance, which would cost them more than the cost of the contract that they would be doing for us.

What we're looking at is - is there a way that we can protect ourselves from the liability of having somebody, perhaps working on our premises, perhaps doing some travel from Point A to Point B, and how do we protect the County from any loss due to law suits, through workers comp kind of injuries. Are these people employees? Are they really independent contractors and how do we handle all of that? That was at the low end.

On the high end, we're talking about dealing with people and million dollar contracts - or millions of dollars in products or services, that's usually not a problem. They usually have whatever insurance is required. But for the smaller contractors, how do we handle that? We also have the question of volunteers. What do we do with volunteers to protect ourselves from the risk of loss of millions of dollars in case there is any sort of law suit or a claim filed against us.

At the present time what we have done is we have between a \$1-3,000,000 general liability that we require of these independent contractors. We've had some come back and say that they could not afford it - can they give us a \$500,000 of liability coverage. We've debated it on an individual basis and said yes or no accordingly. We had a situation at the Juvenile Detention Facility a few weeks ago. It was a wonderful opportunity. The Young Americans wanted to come in and put on some benefit concerts at the Juvenile Detention Facility for the young people that are incarcerated out there...and to do some community service work and talk to the young people who are incarcerated there. We could not get around the liability provisions of what we had to work with. They had no liability coverage. We would have been exposed and would have had the risk of loss to us if anything would have happened between any of our County young people and the Young Americans coming in. We looked at that and decided we could not afford the risk of loss of perhaps millions of dollars by having a group who was volunteering to come in and perform a service that we all felt was of value. So, that's another trigger point in looking at this whole area. How do we handle this to make sure that we're not self-insured for all of these losses? We do have a self-insurance, in effect, due to the fact that we don't have coverage up to the Tort limits of State Statutes. We're trying to cover as many of those bases as we can. That's the whole picture.

Mr. Stevens wondered if the City and the Lincoln Public Schools had the same kinds of concerns and is there were some way we can work together to come up with a common solution to some of those things by a list pool or by joint contracts or whatever it might be. He had no solutions, or how to go about it from there, but it's a risk of loss that we have that we're uncomfortable with at this point.

Mayor Seng suggested that this be put on the Agenda for the next meeting so that we have proper staff here to talk about this from the City side. She commented that she was not sure that everyone understood what the Agenda Item meant until we heard your explanation. She thought the schools may have the staff here today to discuss it, but the City Staff necessary to answer these concerns was not in attendance today.

Mr. Prettyman stated that LPS could get up and tell everyone off the cuff what we do and what the practices are...but he thought the suggestion that the Mayor has made is a great one. It's a subject to which he had not given a great deal of thought, and he did not know that anyone else from the School Board side has either. So, it is an issue that we would like to come back and talk about and let everybody know what it is we do and how we handle it.

Mr. Camp noted that each entity should have its Risk Management personnel in attendance at the next meeting for this discussion.

Mr. Zimmer commented that perhaps the step before that might be to encourage individual staffs to get together. This may really be the best step to initiate it at that level and area of expertise of the joint staffs. They may not need to come back then. We deal in policy matters. He noted that the County Board was a bit different as Administrators and Legislators together, but he would encourage our Risk Staffs to get together with each other and see what can be done. He felt this policy making body should just encourage that to happen.

Dr. Schoo concurred with Dr. Zimmer in his statement that the City, County and School District had staff to handle these issues. We're all involved with insurance. He thought we collectively work together on many issues, and he noted this would be a logical thing for us to look at together and then come back to this group at a future meeting with the Staff findings.

Ms. Larsen pointed out that they also have some commonality because some of our school staff is in the Juvenile Detention Center while providing education classes - particularly providing the basic course skills to those kids on a daily basis....hoping to get through to complete a GED. She would be interested in how LPS Staff is covered in the County Building.

Mr. Eagan added that another component which he had mentioned, the self-insurance, especially in the area of health care, and noted that we've been looking at it and have gone self-insured with dental coverage. That might be another topic for the combined staffs to discuss and bring that back as well - though it is a slightly different issue, but an extremely important and extremely costly one.

Mr. Camp felt that would be an excellent element to include in this - beyond just the liability but the health and dental as well. He asked if there were any other aspect of insurance needs of the entities that we ought to include? Mr. Eagan stated that those were the two problems that they had been wrestling with. He commented that they had been thinking of going self-insured on the general liability and almost did it on a quick decision, then thought better of it and decided to step back and look at it for a year while drawing on the experience of the other entities in making that decision.

Mr. Camp thought it would be good to know an estimated amount being spent on insurance by each entity. This would cover medical, dental, liability or whatever. That would be interesting information. Maybe there is a commonality due to our tax base where we might save some tax dollars.

Mayor Seng commented, on a much smaller note, that they've had people coming in that hold the community events out on the streets and out in the community. She stated that the cost of insurance is very prohibitive for them. They've asked what they could do and she has taken the approach that if somebody is going to get sued, we'd all get sued, so we might as well look at it from the total package. She was sure if DLA was sponsoring something in the downtown area, the City is probably going to be involved in any law suits. She thought that was another little piece of this that could be looked into.

Mr. Camp asked Mr. Eagan to serve as the catalyst in getting the respective Risk management staffs together to look into this matter. Mr. Eagan noted that it was on his list. Mr. Camp thanked him and asked that the issue be continued to the next meeting.

Continuing/New Business - Mr. Stevens had some old business which may effect all different entities. He noted that there is, next Wednesday night, an open discussion on the West By-Pass Upgrade with the Department of Roads from 4:00 to 6:00 p.m. at the Ramada across from the Penitentiary. This is an informational meeting where they will be looking at the whole Highway 77 Corridor, basically, south of the interstate all the way to what would be the new interchange for the South Beltway. That effects Roads and Interchanges throughout that whole Southwest part of Lincoln. It could effect access to schools at the intersection at 14th and Old Cheney; and Warlick Boulevard will be re-engineered in its entirety, so it might effect some of our constituents

There was brief discussion of the closing of Old Cheney at 14th Street as well as Rokeby Road which would be discussed at the meeting. Several members of the group thought they would attend the meeting. Mr. Hudkins felt, even though these were State Projects, unless the City and County okayed them, the State probably wouldn't move forward with them.

Mr. Hudkins commented on another issue regarding State Fair Park and the future of that facility. The Chamber called a meeting to try to address what the future of State Fair Park will be. It's crunch time and the community is going to have to make decisions on whether the Fair goes on as it was, or is reduced to a more lean machine, or eliminated entirely. Those were the options discussed yesterday. He stated that the School Board has used some of those facilities to help them out during building projects. The County uses it as a point of visitor promotion to bring people into Lincoln/Lancaster County. So, it is something that will effect us all.

Ms. Larsen commented that she felt it was good idea to have this meeting televised, because then it shows the public that there is collaborative effort between the School Board, the City Council and the County. She appreciated the opportunity to be here in this venue and having it televised for the public. She presumed that this was not just a trial basis, but rather something that will continue. Mr. Camp answered that that has been the thought. This was just the imitation of the process. He wasn't sure how it would work at other facilities, but we may just have to schedule a location so that it accommodates the broadcasting of the meeting. Ms. Larsen noted that they have that capability available at the District Offices.

Mr. Stevens commented that the discussion from other meetings was that it would be televised whenever it was practical to do so, but if it wasn't practical based on the location, it would not be televised, because none of us were willing to incur much expense at all to have the camera crews going on the road off-site.

Future Meeting Date - January 20th, 2004 at the Boy Scout Camp. [The location was later changed to the School Administration Office - Same time, Same date]

VIII Adjournment: 8:45 a.m.

jointLPSminutes110403